DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 091 SO 015 086

AUTHOR Hirschman, Charles; Wong, Morrison G.
TITLE Immigration, Education and Asian-Americans: A Cohort Analysis.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE 83
GRANT HD-16309
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Detroit, MI, August 31-September 4, 1983). One chart contains small type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Asian Americans; Chinese Americans; Cultural Background; *Educational Attainment; Filipino Americans; *Immigrants; Japanese Americans; Minority Groups

ABSTRACT

Asian-Americans are educational overachievers, and have been for many decades. There are various explanations for the high educational achievement of Asian-Americans. The most frequently cited theory is that their native culture places a premium on ambition, persistence, and deferred gratification. Other theories attribute this success to different factors such as the Asian groups' tradition of cultural borrowing, their respect for authority, and their emphasis on the collective good. An analysis of the 1960 and 1970 U.S. censuses suggests a positive correlation between American immigration restrictions and the educational attainment of three groups of Asian immigrants--the Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos. This can probably be attributed to the fact that as restrictions tightened, Asian immigrants had to meet high occupational criteria, which presupposed higher education. Settled in the United States, these groups found that, despite discrimination, education paid off in terms of occupational and social mobility, and this reinforced their pre-existing values. While all three groups have shown significant educational improvement across successive birth cohorts, the patterns of their success have differed. (Author/LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236091

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles Hirschman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IMMIGRATION, EDUCATION AND ASIAN-AMERICANS: A COHORT ANALYSIS

Charles Hirschman
Department of Sociology
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Morrison G. Wong
Department of Sociology
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

50 015 086

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 31-September 4, 1983, Detroit.

*This research has been supported by a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD 16309), "Asian-Americans: Immigration and Adaptation." We thank Luis M. Falcon, Keiko Yamanaka, and Suzanne M. Sauer for their excellent research assistance.

IMMIGRATION, EDUCATION AND ASIAN-AMERICANS:
A COHORT ANALYSIS

ABSTRACT

The achievement or overachievement of Asian-Americans in education is evident in a wide variety of reports from classroom behavior and test scores, as well as in the over-representation of Asian-Americans in institutions of higher education. Explanations regarding the high educational achievements of Asian-Americans (and Jews) have been varied, sometimes conflicting, and always subject to debate. An analysis of the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses suggests that immigration and immigration policies may have had a major impact in the educational success of Asians in America. The contemporary pattern of Asian-American educational success has roots that extend back to the late 19th and early 20th century, and there are somewhat different paths to "educational success" which are evident in the records of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino native-born and foreign-born populations.

INTRODUCTION

Contrary to the popular image, Asian-Americans have not achieved equality in all spheres of American society. Their record of occupational and earnings attainment is positive relative to other minorities, but still short of full parity with the majority population (Hirschman and Wong, 1982; Jiobu, 1976; Kitano and Sue, 1973; Kuo, 1981; Wong, 1980a, 1982; Woodrum, 1981). In the field of education, however, the record of Asian-Americans is one of consistent over-achievement. For young adults (age 25-34) in 1970, the average Japanese-American (14.0 yrs.) had one and a half more years of schooling than the average white (12.6 yrs.), and the figure for Chinese-Americans was even higher (16.1 yrs.) (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973a:628; 1973b:17,76). The success of Asian-Americans in schooling is evident in a wide variety of reports from classroom behavior, test scores, as well as over-representation in institutions of higher education (Kitano, 1976:98-99; Levine and Montero, 1973; Lyman, 1974:133-8; Montero and Tsukashima, 1977; Petersen, 1971:113-22; Schmid and Nobbe, 1965; Schwartz, 1970, 1971; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978:14-15; Vernon, 1982:170-82; Wong, 1980b). Filipino-Americans have made significant gains in recent years and are beginning to approach the levels of Chinese- and Japanese-Americans (Hirschman and Wong, 1981).

While the over-achievement of Asian-Americans in education is most evident at the present, their advantage goes back several decades -- certainly prior to the relaxation of prejudice and discrimination. The coincidence of minority status with the associated hostility and high educational attainment is not an unknown phenomenon. The most widely

cited example is that of Jewish-Americans and the pattern may well be representative of other middleman minorities (Blalock, 1967:79-84; Bonacich, 1973; van den Berghe, 1981:Ch.7). Since conventional theories of ethnic stratification suggest that discrimination should limit achievement among minorities, the source of this over-achievement in education represents an anomaly to be investigated. Are there additional resources available to some minority groups which allow for the mitigation of the effects of discrimination or is there variation in opportunity structure for minority group achievement? Through an historical analysis of Asian-American educational attainment, we address these issues within the context of available data.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Explanations regarding the high educational achievement of certain minorities, such as the Asian-Americans and the Jews, have been varied, sometimes conflicting, and almost always subject to debate. There has been no consensus as to which factor or factors best explain the high educational achievement of certain minorities. In this section, we present the major theoretical perspectives or explanations which have been used to account for higher than average educational achievements of Asians and Jews.

Probably the most frequently cited or conventional explanation for successful minorities is the cultural interpretation of differential values toward achievement (Rosen, 1959). According to this thesis, some ethnic groups are able to achieve, in spite of discrimination, because their culture places a premium on ambition, persistence, deferred

gratification, and social mobility. Parents and kinsmen transmit these values to their offspring which leads to high motivation for worldly success. In an atmosphere of prejudice, minority achievement is most likely to be evident in formal educational institutions which hold universalistic and competitive norms. Empirical tests of the cultural interpretation have been limited by the usual lack of direct measures of values such as ambition and educational aspirations. Studies which do include such cultural orientations have not provided strong support for cultural explanations of differential ethnic economic attainment (Featherman, 1971). However, the available evidence suggests that cultural orientations play a stronger role in the explanation of ethnic educational attainment (Featherman, 1971; Rhodes and Nam, 1970; Stryker, 1981).

Even among scholars who share the cultural perspective as the primary explanation of the educational achievements of Asian-Americans, there is disagreement on the source and content of the salient cultural values. Some argue that it is the traditional Japanese values stemming from the Tokugawa era (1603-1867) which account for the high educational achievement of the Japanese-Americans. Hence, Caudill (1952) and Caudill and DeVos (1956) conclude that while the overt behavior of the Nisei (second-generation Japanese) may, in many situations, be indistinguishable from the behavior of the white middle class, the source is the traditional Japanese value system and personality. According to this interpretation, there seems to be a significant overlap between the value systems of traditional Japan and of the American middle-class which encourages high educational achievement. Schwartz (1970, 1971), however, argues that the high scholastic

achievement of Japanese-Americans is due mainly to traditional Japanese value orientations, such as emphasis on "collective" rather than "individual" action and respect for authority (either at home in the traditional Japanese family or to teachers in the classroom environment) -- which are not those of middle-class whites. Similar arguments have been used by Hsu (1971) and Sung (1967) in their application of the cultural perspective to the educational and subsequent occupational success of Chinese-Americans. Both argue that traditional Chinese culture, as exemplified by family unity, respect for elders and those in authority, industry, a high value on education, and personal discipline account for the exceptionally high educational achievements of the Chinese in America.

Another variant of the culturalist perspective argues that it is not the traditional Asian values, but the successful assimilation by the Asians to the American middle class value system that accounts for their high level of achievement. Kitano (1969:3,112) argues that part of the reason for the success of Japanese-Americans is that they have been very successful in adopting the values, skills, attitudes, goals, and expected behavior of the middle-class majority. However, he does note that the acculturation of the Japanese has not been because their culture and the American middle class are the same but rather because of the functional compatability and the interaction between the two. Montero and Tsukashima (1977) find that Nisei who had low fluency in Japanese, lived outside the ethnic confines, had co-workers and friends outside their ethnic group, belonged to ethnically mixed social organizations, were not disturbed about out-marriages, had spouses of another ethnic group, and identified themselves as Americans had higher

educational attainment than the Nisei who did not. Hence, they conclude that the greater the asimilation of the Nisei respondent, the higher the educational achievement. Other researchers suggest the opposite. Kitano (1962) and Connor (1975) find a gradual decline in academic achievement of Japanese-Americans as they become more assimilated. They argue that longer residence in the United States has led to more assimilation and less orientation toward achievement. They claim that the high academic achievements of the Japanese-Americans was largely due to the denial of opportunities to participate in social and other extra-curricular school activities in the pre-World War II period. This situation left academic success as the only path for achievement. Since the present generation of Japanese-Americans now have greater opportunities to participate socially, this thesis suggests that academic achievement (or overachievement) would decline.

From this brief review of the cultural perspective on the educational achievement of Asian minorities in the United States, there is no clear consensus on the importance of this perspective, nor on which values (traditional or white middle class) are the key to their higher educational achievement. Moreover, empirical research is inconclusive on the consequences of the assimilation of American middle-class values.

Alternative theoretical frameworks do not deny the importance of cultural values, but put them in a larger context of the structural conditions that create and sustain such orientations. These include immigrant status, social class position, and other institutional resources.

Immigrant status is often associated with selectivity in the country of origin. A theme which runs throughout the immigration literature is the selectivity of immigrants as an explanation of their rapid socioeconomic gains of foreign-born over native-born after several years (Chiswick, 1979; U.S. Department of Labor, 1979). Moreover, the experience of long distance migration may inspire an intense committment towards achievement in the new setting, which is transferred to the children of immigrants. This sense of committment to success may be reinforced by the response of the host society to immigrants. Typically, immigrants encounter social and racial discrimination, although the degree may vary considerably. A moderate degree of prejudice which does not completely block mobility may serve to reinforce a high level of motivation, e.g., "We have to be twice as good as the natives to be hired or to succeed." Yee (1976) argues that Asians need educational and other qualifications superior to those of white candidates in order to get appointed to high grade jobs. He contends that Asians are employed as professionals and in staff technical positions, but are rarely put in positions with white subordinates.

Although it has been argued that Japanese immigrants were poor peasants who became upwardly mobile (Glazer, 1969), others conclude that many of the early Japanese came with above-average educational backgrounds (Ichihashi, 1932:65-78; Strong, 1970). Kitano (1969:13,23) and Petersen (1971:13-14) seem to believe that both arguments are true -- that many of the early immigrants to Hawaii were indeed lower class whereas many of the later ones to the mainland were superior in their educational levels, abilities and ambition. A similar argument has been

presented by Steinberg (1981:Ch.3) who concludes that Jewish immigrants in the late 19th century and early 20th century had a social class advantage over other contemporary European immigrants. While extremely poor, Jewish immigrants tended to have urban-artisan backgrounds. Compared to other immigrants with rural peasant origins, Jewish immigrants were able to take greater advantage of the available opportunities in the United States, especially for schooling of their children.

A related theme to the selectivity of immigrants is the middleman minority thesis which ties together the position of the sojourner community (a more-or-less permanent immigrant population) along with a concentration in entrepreneurial roles (Bonacich, 1973; Kitano, 1974; Loewen, 1971). In such circumstances, minorities are disposed to invest in liquid capital that can be easily moved. Human capital, or education, might be seen as an investment with a high level of security.

Another factor which may be instrumental in the success of the Asian groups in the United States is the resources which were available to these immigrants from their ethnic communities which aided them in their adjustment and adaptation in American society, and subsequently, their success in their climb up the socioeconomic ladder (Bonacich, 1975; Hsu, 1971; Li, 1977; Light, 1972; Miyamoto, 1972; Wong, 1976; Woodrum et al., 1980). The ethnic community with its family, clan, district and other social organizations were a potential resource for Asian immigrants. Having limited capital, they were able to effectively use the established rotating credit associations and other social organizations to gain an economic foothold. This was later followed by substantial educational achievement, if not for themselves, for their

children (Light, 1972). Lieberson (1980:15) also notes that the influx of "new" Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe at the turn of the century had the potential resource of the earlier wave of German Jewish immigrants. While the cultural differences between these two groups were quite wide, there was probably a certain degree of sponsorship and assistance to the new immigrants (note the parallel to recent waves of Cuban immigration).

Lieberson (1980:Ch.12) speculates that Asian immigrants were able to insulate themselves from societal discrimination through their specialization in certain sectors of the economy. The importance of the ethnic economy for the sponsorship of the social mobility of Asian-Americans is another theme in the literature (Bonacich and Modell, 1980; Light, 1972). Ethnic enterprises are a base to both provide employment and to mobilize capital. But exactly how does a concentration in small business activities lead to educational ambition and success? After acknowledging that family and ethnic solidarity as well as a decline in discrimination probably promoted the education and ambition of second-generation Japanese-Americans (Nisei), Bonacich and Modell (1980:152) suggest that a deeper root springs from the ethnic economy. Providing their children with higher education was a means by which their children could enter the ranks of the "independent professions, the pinnacle of the petit bourgeois world, or to take over the family business or farm and run it more efficiently". Higher education of the Nisei had an unintentional consequence of being used as a stepping stone to leaving the ethnic economy. Instead of strengthening it, higher education often provided an avenue of escape.

Our study, based upon census data, will allow only an indirect test of some of these competing theoretical formulations.

DATA AND VARIABLES

Our analysis of Asian-American educational trends relies upon data from the 1960 and 1970 Population Censuses of the United States. Because educational attainment is a relatively stable characteristic during the adult years, analysis of educational change by age in a cross-sectional census (or survey) can be taken to represent historical change across successive birth cohorts. Population censuses are one of the few national data sources which will generate sufficient numbers of small minorities, such as Asian-Americans, for statistical analysis. Using both the 1960 and 1970 Censuses allows us to push the cohort analysis a step further at either end of the time-series (the oldest and youngest). Depending upon the analytical purpose, we use either the 1960 or 1970 data, or both, in different tables. We have conducted all analyses with both data sources and the basic trends and patterns are broadly similar.

We begin our analysis of Asian-American educational patterns with published census data, which provides the most reliable estimates of the universe. Published census tabulations of social and economic characteristics of Asian-Americans are based upon samples of 25% and 20% of the total population for 1960 and 1970, respectively. In order to pursue more detailed socioeconomic analysis, we used Public Use Sample data for the 1960 and 1970 Censuses. From the .01 samples of both 1960 and 1970 (15% questionnaire, state sample), we selected all Japanese,

Chinese, and Filipinos above age 25. This yields samples of 2640 Japanese, 1324 Chinese, and 1034 Filipinos in 1960, and 3463 Japanese, 2351 Chinese, and 1772 Filipinos in 1970. Comparable samples of the Anglo population (whites minus white Hispanics) were selected from the .001 Public Use Samples of the 1960 and 1970 Censuses (Ns of the Anglo sample of population above age 25 was 8309 in 1960 and 7976 in 1970). Even with the substantial samples, specific age groups by other characteristics resulted in very small cell sizes. Accordingly, we are careful to avoid excessive interpretation of small differences in the data.

The primary dependent variable, educational attainment, is measured as the number of years of completed schooling, with a range from 0 to 18. Individuals with more than 18 years of schooling are coded with a score of 18 years.

Independent variables are limited to the standard census item. Age, grouped by ten year intervals, is transformed to represent birth cohorts from "Before 1895" to "1935-44". Nativity is measured by place of birth: whether in the United States or overseas. The foreign-born are assumed to have had the education in their country-of-birth, although this will be in err for immigrants who arrived as children. Within the United States, the states of California and Hawaii are considered to be important geographical settings (both as a state of birth and state of current residence) for Asian-Americans.

PATTERNS OF ASIAN IMMIGRATION

Although the pace of Asian immigration to the United States has increased dramatically since the reform legislation of the 1965 Immigration Act (Wong and Hirschman, 1983), the historic roots of Asian immigration extend back to the middle of the 19th century. As European immigrants began to arrive in increasingly large numbers on the East Coast, a similar process was occurring on the West Coast from Asia, with Hawaii as a frequent stepping stone. Table 1 presents the available data on the number of immigrants, by decade, for the three major Asian sending countries: China, Japan, and the Philippines. Since the quality and coverage of immigration statistics has varied sharply over the years, these figures should not be considered to be anything more than crude indicators of the magnitude of Asian immigration. Moreover, since emigration was very substantial, sometimes equal to the volume of immigration, the net magnitude of international migration is only partially reflected in these figures.

Table 1 About Here

From this table, we note that the first Asian group to arrive to the United States were the Chinese, arriving in significant numbers during the 1850s to work in the gold mines in California and later on the railroads. Most of the Chinese immigrants were young male sojourners who came to the United States to seek their fortune, planning to return to China. Ethnic antagonism developed between the white laborers and the Chinese leading to many violent attacks on the Chinese

population. Political pressures built up resulting in the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which sharply curtailed further labor migration from China. This act was renewed in 1892, then made a permanent feature of United States immigration policy in 1904. A small number of officials, merchants, teachers, students and travelers were excluded from this ban (McKenzie, 1928). Moreover, up until 1934, wives and children or other nonexcludable immigrants could lawfully enter the United States. In the 1940-50 decade, several changes in immigration law -- such as the Refugee Act, the War Brides Act, and the establishment of a token quota system of 105 Chinese immigrants per year -- increased the level of Chinese immigration to the United States. The tremendous rise in the number of Chinese coming to the United States, beginning in the 1960-1970 decade, is mainly due to the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1965, which struck down the United States racist immigration policies (national origin quotas). The new laws put a premium on family reunification and scarce occupational skills, with the result that many more Chinese were allowed to enter the United States.

The Japanese were the second Asian group to immigrate in large numbers to the United States. After the exclusion of the Chinese, Japanese immigration became the new source of cheap labor for the West Coast during the last decade of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century. Ethnic antagonism developed against the Japanese (as it did for the Chinese before them, see Daniels, 1977:16-30). The decade of 1901-1910 marked the peak of Japanese immigration, culminating in the so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1908, whereby Japan limited migration to the United States to only nonlaborers. The continued level of Japanese immigration in the following two decades consisted mostly of

"picture-brides" and the kin of Japanese already in the United States. The passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 barred further migration of Japanese to the United States. Japanese immigration to the United States resumed in the 1950s to a level of about 40,000 per decade. The Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran-Walter) of 1952 allowed immigration outside of the quota system for immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and other selected cases. This act also established a token quota of 185 immigrants from Japan. The Immigration Act of 1965 appears to have had relatively little impact on Japanese immigration compared to that of other Asian countries.

The third Asian group to arrive to the shores of the United States, although occurring much later, was the Filipinos. Many first immigrated to Hawaii to work on the sugar and pineapple plantations. Migration of large numbers of Filipinos to the United States did not begin until 1923, coming directly from the Phillipines or indirectly through Hawaii (California, Department of Industrial Relations, 1930:15-23). Because Filipinos were considered nationals of the United States, they were not subject to the 1924 ban on Asian immigration. However, the Tydings-McDuffie Act (Filipino Exclusion Act) of 1934 placed an "alien" status on Filipinos, thereby restricting Filipino immigration to fifty persons per year. In 1946, an immigration quota of 100 persons was established for Filipino immigrants. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and especially the Immigration Act of 1965 appear to have had significant consequences on the immigrant flow of Filipinos to the United States.

Another vantage point to view the historic patterns of Asian immigration to the United States is to examine the numbers of

Asian-Americans in successive censuses. These figures, along with the percent foreign-born, are reported for Hawaii and the U.S. mainland in Table 2. The Asian population in the United States is largely concentrated in three states -- Hawaii, California, and New York (the latter only for the Chinese). The geographical distribution of Asians has been clearly related to the settlement patterns of the immigrants (Wong, 1983; Wong and Hirschman, 1982).

Table 2 About Here

For the Japanese and Filipino populations, international migration began to Hawaii, then migrating on to the U.S. mainland, particularly the West Coast. For Chinese, the movement to the mainland began earlier and was always more substantial than the migration to Hawaii. For example, during the first half of this century, only a quarter of all Chinese-Americans resided in Hawaii compared to half of Japanese- and Filipino-Americans. In the last couple of decades, with renewed immigration to the mainland, the balance has shifted even further. In 1970, almost two-thirds of Japanese, three-fourths of Filipinos, and nine out of ten Chinese lived on the mainland.

During the twentieth century, the Asian population in Hawaii, especially the Chinese and Japanese, has become increasingly native-born. By 1970, about 90% of the Japanese and Chinese and two-thirds of the Filipinos in Hawaii were native-born. The shift to native-born majorities has been much slower for the Asian-Americans on the mainland. The transition to an American-born majority is most evident among the Japanese population, which has had more than two-thirds native-born for

several decades. For a variety of reasons, including a smaller share of women (and therefore children), about half of mainland Chinese and Filipinos were still foreign-born at mid-century. Because of the sharp rise of Asian immigration in the late 1960s, the proportion foreign-born of Chinese and Filipinos increased between 1960 and 1970, a trend that continued in the 1970s.

THE TREND IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

In the subsequent analysis of educational change, we always examine the foreign-born and native-born populations independently (separately by ethnic origin). We also consider the differences by geographical location. Not only does the nativity composition vary sharply between areas of settlement, but we suspect that there are other significant differences in the social and economic environment.

To examine the question of Asian-American educational success, we turn to the historic trend in educational attainment of Asians relative to the majority population. To the extent that patterns of attainment vary over time and systematically with other factors, it may be possible to specify the reasons for minority achievement. Since most individuals finish their formal schooling before reaching adulthood, it is possible to trace the historical change of successive birth cohorts by examining the trend from the oldest to the youngest age-group (of adults). The interpretation and potential bias are somewhat different for the two nativity groups (foreign- and native-born).

For the foreign-born, educational levels probably reflect opportunities in the country of origin (assuming most immigrants finished schooling before migration) and the selectivity of the immigrant stream. For the native-born, a comparison of Asians and the majority population reflects the differential opportunities for schooling in American society. Longitudinal inferences from cross-sectional data assume that the current populations, arrayed by age, reflects the experiences of successive cohorts at earlier points in time. For the native-born, differential mortality could bias the representativeness of older age-groups (cohorts), although we think the impact will be relatively minor. The foreign-born population will not only experience differential mortality, but also selective return-migration to the country of origin. Although we have no firm estimates of the magnitude or composition of return-migration, its effects could be substantial (Jasso and Rosenzweig, 1982; Warren and Peck, 1980). Accordingly, the trend of educational change among foreign-born must be carefully interpreted. To the extent that the least successful emigrated, the present sample may over-represent the more qualified of the older cohorts.

With the relatively small numbers of Asians in the public use samples of census data, sampling error is a problem for the inference of change across cohorts. Accordingly, we begin with data drawn from the published census reports based upon a substantial sample (25%). Table 3 shows the median years of completed schooling by sex, nativity status, ethnicity, and birth cohort based upon 1960 Census data. The same comparisons are shown in Table 4, with another indicator -- the index of net difference.

Tables 3 and 4 - About Here

The net difference index (ND) is based on each group's distribution in all locations along the educational continuum (Lieberson, 1975). Assuming all possible pairings of two groups, the index of .50 means that the white group's education will exceed the Asian group's level 50% more often than will the Asian group exceed the white group. If all the white group's scores exceed all the Asian group scores, the index will be +1.0. Conversely, if all the Asian scores exceed the white group scores, the ND will be -1.0. The value of zero means that the number of pairs in which the white group exceeds the Asian group is equal to the number of pairs in which the Asian group exceeds the white group.

Among the oldest cohort of immigrants (born before 1895), there is a sharp contrast between the Japanese and the other two Asian populations. Even among this early group of immigrants, presumably arriving around the turn of the century, the Japanese male population (at least among the 1960 survivors) appears to be as selective as the total white population (median of about 8 years). In contrast, the oldest cohort of Chinese and Filipino immigrants was a relatively less selective stream (Chinn, 1969; Kung, 1962; Lasker, 1931). This is an important point that will be discussed later in the analysis.

In general Asian female immigrants had lower educational levels than Asian male immigrants, but the differences between the sexes were relatively minor. The most important finding is the rapid rise in educational levels of successive cohorts of Asian immigrants which led to parity with and then to relative superiority to the white population. As noted above, Japanese immigrants were particularly well qualified,

even among the oldest cohort. But all three Asian immigrant populations showed dramatic increases in their educational levels across successive birth cohorts. The relative gains can be seen by comparing the median educational attainments of Asian immigrants with white and Black Americans in Table 3 and most clearly in the indexes of net difference in Table 4.

A negative index means that more Asian immigrants had educational attainments than exceeded white educational levels than vice versa. Among the male immigrant population, Japanese educational levels exceeded the white U.S. population attainments by the 1915-24 birth cohort. By the 1925-34 birth cohort, male Chinese and Filipino immigrants registered a similar accomplishment. Asian female immigrants reached educational parity with white U.S. women (or exceeded them), but at a slower pace than that of Asian men.

The trend in the educational attainment of native-born Asian-Americans parallels the pattern of immigrants, but with some important differences. Among the oldest cohort, those who attended American schools before World War I, the Japanese Nisei held their own with the average white (less so for females). Native-born Filipinos, and especially Chinese, were considerably lower in their educational attainments -- comparable to the levels of Black-Americans of the same generation. But then quite dramatically, Asian-American, especially Chinese, educational levels rose sharply. The net difference indexes in Table 4 show that by the 1915-24 cohort (schooled in the 1920s and 30s) native born Chinese and Japanese (both men and women) had higher educational levels than whites. Since then Japanese and Chinese

educational superiority has increased and native-born Filipinos have approached parity with whites.

Further exploration of these trends is considered in the following sections of this paper.

ASIAN IMMIGRANTS

In this section, we consider more closely trends in the socioeconomic composition of Asian immigrants. To obtain the longest span of cohorts, we splice together cohorts (age-groups) from the Public Use Samples of the 1960 and 1970 Censuses. Moving from published census tabulations to the public use sample census data provides more flexibility for data analysis and presentation, but at the cost of less reliability because of the smaller sample sizes. Modest differences could easily be due to sampling variations. Our aim here is to report major differentials and general trends.

Table 5 presents mean years of schooling and occupational status (the Duncan Socioeconomic Index) for the three major Asian immigrant populations and comparison groups of native-born and foreign-born Anglos by sex. In addition to the means, we also present the coefficients of variation (the standard deviation divided by the mean) for the educational and occupational means. In general, the trends in Table 5 confirm and amplify the basic patterns revealed in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 5 - About Here

Not only did the earliest wave of Japanese immigrants possess higher educational qualifications than the oldest Chinese and Filipino

immigrants, but they (Japanese immigrants) were a much more homogeneous immigrant stream. This factor may have given the Japanese immigrant population more internal solidarity (less social class variation) among Asian groups. For successive birth cohorts of Asian immigrants (which are only loosely related to actual cohorts of immigrants defined by the timing of entry), educational qualifications rose in a dramatic fashion. Beginning with the birth cohort of 1915-1924, Asian immigrant educational levels equaled or exceeded that of Anglos, both native-born and foreign-born. For the youngest cohorts, the mean years of schooling exceeded 12 years, and in some cases (Japanese men) the average is 15 years of schooling. As rapidly as overall educational qualifications rose, variance declined. Although educational attainment among Asian female immigrants is a bit below Asian men, the same general patterns hold -- rapid inter-cohort rise in average educational levels and declines in variance. The distinctively high education of the youngest Filipino female immigrants is a clear example of this pattern.

The lower panel in Table 5 presents the average occupational status of the same cohorts of Asian immigrants and native-born and foreign-born Anglos. Since individuals often change their occupation over their adult years (unlike educational attainment), the inference of a time-series trend (from the oldest to the youngest age group) rests on weaker ground. Nonetheless, some broad observations can be made (these data refer only to the subset of the sample that reported an occupation). The rise of occupational status across cohorts was a bit slower, although the youngest Asian immigrants report very high occupational levels. The earliest wave of Japanese immigrants are not distinctively superior in their occupational status (as they were in

their educational attainment). In fact, the average Chinese immigrant occupational status was above the Japanese mean for the first several birth cohorts. From the oldest to the youngest cohorts, the heterogeneity of Japanese male immigrants was reduced, but not for the Chinese. Filipino men and all women immigrants have increased their occupational status sharply across the cohorts in our sample. It was not until the 1925-1934 birth cohort of males and the youngest birth cohort of women that one notes higher socioeconomic attainment by Asians over native-born or foreign-born Anglos.

Any interpretation of the determinants of the changing character of Asian immigration must rely on a considerable amount of inference and conjecture. We have very little hard information on the patterns and selectivity of immigrant streams, their early experiences in the U.S., or the magnitude and composition of return migration. But the data on earlier waves of Asian immigrants who survived to be interviewed in the 1960 and 1970 Population Censuses provide some bases for interpretation.

Japanese immigrants were a very select population, even for those arriving around the turn of the century. For the Chinese and Filipino populations, the earliest immigrants had only minimal qualifications. But then over successive cohorts, the qualifications of Asian immigrants of all nationalities, male and female, have risen dramatically. While the label of a brain-drain may be a stereotype, the educational composition of recent Asian immigrants has been rather extraordinary (Chen, 1977; North, 1974; Pernia, 1976).

It seems that the educational qualifications of Asian immigrants have been closely related to the restrictive U.S. immigration policies towards Asians. For Chinese, the open door policy ended with the

infamous Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Prior to this date, it seems that most Chinese immigrants were laborers with minimal educational qualifications -- comparable to the pattern of European immigration stream of the same era. After the immigration bar, Chinese immigration continued, but at much reduced levels. (Moreover, the exodus of return migration meant that the absolute numbers of Chinese in the U.S. declined for several decades). To get around the restrictions against Chinese immigration, the new Chinese arrivals had to fit rather narrow criteria -- officals, merchants, teachers, students, traders, or the alien wives or children of these nonexcludable classes, or kin to a U.S. citizen of Chinese ancestry. It is not unreasonable to assume that this meant (or was corrrelated with) a higher level of educational qualifications. For the youngest cohorts who arrived in the 1950s and after the 1965 Immigration Act (many as students), the avenue of immigration was scarce occupational skills which typically meant advanced educational degrees, such as medicine, engineering, and other technical fields.

Early Japanese immigrants entered the U.S. labor market at the bottom, typically as farm laborers. Yet their above-average educational levels gave them a unique advantage. The 1908 "Gentlemen's Agreement" restricted further Japanese labor migration, but left loopholes until they were closed by the 1924 legislation. A reasonable assumption is that the restrictions worked to further increase the selectivity of Japanese immigrants. When Japanese immigration resumed on a moderate scale in the 1950s and 1960s, the legal channels for admission only permitted those with highly skilled credentials to enter.

The composition of Filipino immigration appears to parallel the Chinese experience -- several decades later and on a smaller scale. Beginning as an influx of migrants with minimal qualifications, the average level of education rose for successive cohorts as immigration restrictions were put into place. Then in the wake of the 1965 reform legislation, Filipinos immigrants came in increasing numbers with unusually high educational standards.

In a perverse way, the racist character of U.S. immigration policy toward Asia may have strengthened the capacity of the Asian communities in the U.S. The door, while not completely closed, limited the inflow of immigrants to modest numbers. Moreover, it also meant that the newcomers had above-average levels of education, often superior to the native white population of the United States. This certainly minimized pressures on the resident Asian communities to absorb and sponsor the new immigrants for the first half of the twentieth century. Moreover, the selective character of the immigrant stream probably strengthened the economic achievements of Asian-Americans and set high expectations for the educational attainments of their children.

NATIVE-BORN ASIAN-AMERICANS

In this section, we trace changes in average level of education across successive cohorts of native-born Asian-Americans using 1970 Census data arrayed by age. Assuming that the potential for educational attainment is randomly distributed across ethnic populations, variation in achievement will reflect differential opportunities and the economic, social and cultural environments of the home and community.

Table 6 presents mean years of schooling sub-divided into graded schooling (1-12) and college (1-6) for the three major Asian populations (Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos) and Anglos (whites excluding white Hispanics) by state of birth. The mean years of completed schooling is the sum of the two components: years of graded schooling and years of college. Since the educational and the social environment may differ across geographical settings, the results are presented separately for the major areas of Asian-American concentration (California and Hawaii) and the balance of the country. State of birth is the proxy for area of residence during age at schooling. There are too few Anglos in Hawaii in our sample to provide reliable estimates by age group. Table 6 also contains another component of the educational process -- the proportion of each population that has attended college (attained 13 or more years of schooling). In this table we have collapsed men and women together. Separate analysis by sex and by generation (2nd vs. 3rd or higher generations in the U.S.) did not reveal sufficient differences to warrant separate presentation.

Table 6 - About Here

The trend in the educational atttainment for Anglos reflects the expansion of education in America during the 20th century. The oldest cohort (born before 1905) received an average of 9 to 10 years of education in the period prior to World War I. Average education was slightly higher in California than elsewhere, but the level of college attendance was a bit lower in California. The average years of schooling grew steadily across successive cohorts and was over 13 years in California and above 12 years elsewhere for the youngest cohort

(1935-44) whose schooling was centered in the 1950s. The components of educational growth were an almost universally high level of graded schooling and an increasing percentage attending college. Almost half of the youngest cohort born in California attended college, but less than one-third of those from other states did.

The comparable levels of education for Japanese and Chinese do not fit the expectation of disadvantaged minorities. Native-born Japanese had comparable or higher educational attainments than Anglos for all the cohorts represented in this table. For the older cohorts, it seems that Japanese-Anglo parity reflects roughly similar levels of graded schooling and college attendance. Japanese from California did better than Japanese elsewhere, as did Anglos. It is the younger two Japanese cohorts, especially the youngest (born from 1935-44), whose educational attainment begins to advance significantly above the Anglo level. The slight Japanese edge in the 1925-34 cohort was primarily due to higher levels of secondary schooling completion. But the 1935-44 cohort of Japanese sharply increased their educational attainment through a dramatic jump in college attendance -- 30 percentage points in California (44 to 75). The increases in Hawaii and in other states were somehwat less, but still outstripped the educational gains of Anglos.

The educational achievements of native-born Chinese-Americans are no less impressive, but the trajectory of historical change was somewhat different. For the oldest cohort of native-born Chinese, their average educational levels were far below the Anglo level, especially in California. Then in the next cohort (1905-14) whose schooling was centered in the 1920s, native-born Chinese registered sharp increases in their educational attainments (most strongly in California, but also in

Hawaii and elsewhere) and reached parity with Anglos. An important component of the educational progress of native-born Chinese was above average levels of college attendance (primarily in California). Then in successive cohorts, native-born Chinese maintained educational equality with Anglos or a modest edge (California). Finally, in the youngest cohort, Chinese educational advances jumped far ahead of Anglos -- primarily through higher levels of college attendance. The pattern of change of the youngest cohort of Chinese closely resembles the comparable shift for native-born Japanese.

The analysis of the historical trend of educational attainment of native-born Filipinos rests on a much weaker empirical base. The numbers of cases in most cells are quite small and any interpretation of trends must be considered tentative. There has been a steady expansion of native-born Filipino educational attainment, with the most important shift occurring from the 1915-24 to 1925-34 birth cohort in Hawaii -- where average education rose by almost 2½ years. Schooling continued to expand for the youngest cohort of native-born Filipinos in Hawaii, but there appears to have been a leveling off of educational gains (a small decline) for Filipinos in the rest of the U.S. Since this observation rests on a very small sample, further investigation is necessary to confirm this trend. Overall, there appears to have been a trend towards a narrowing of the Anglo-Filipino educational gap, but parity had still not been achieved.

It seems that Japanese and Chinese families have been able to confront the societal discrimination of the first half of the century and encourage/support the education of their American-born children at levels comparable (or above) that of the majority population. The

cohort of American-born Chinese educated before World War I experienced an educational disadvantage, but this disappeared in the next cohort. Japanese and Chinese born in California did best of all, but those in other parts of the country also achieved educational levels equal to or above whites. It appears that an explanation for Asian-American educational success cannot be specified in terms of favorable geographical settings alone.

One possibility might be that the utility of education differed for Asian-Americans than for Anglos. A common observation in the race relations literature is that the lower economic gains associated with minority education provided weaker incentives for continued schooling (Blau and Duncan, 1967:211-212). This hypothesis suggests the economic value of education influences the degree of structural support for schooling by the family and other social situations. If education "matters", then parents and students will be more motivated to invest in "human capital" as a channel for social mobility. This assumes that the opportunities for schooling are available on a universalistic basis.

Table 7 provides a modest test of the structural incentives for educational investment among successive cohorts of native-born Asian-American males with 1970 Census data. Occupational attainment (indexed by the Duncan socioeconomic index) is regressed on a set of ethnic dummy variables (Anglo is the omitted category), current residence, years of schooling and three ethnic by years of schooling interaction terms. Metric (unstandardized) regression coefficients can be compared across birth cohorts (each column is a separate equation). The shift in occupational levels across the life cycle is confounded with inter-cohort change, but this does not appear to bias the results

(similar equations were estimated with 1960 Census data and the results are consistent with those presented here).

Table 7 - About Here

The most consistent finding from Table 7 is the strong effect of years of schooling on occupational attainment in each birth cohort. Among the oldest cohort (above age 65 in 1970), each year of schooling is associated with an increase of 3 SEI points; this rises to an effect of almost 5 points in the youngest cohort. The direct ethnic effects and the ethnic by education interactions do not reveal common trends for all three Asian populations.

The net Japanese ethnic variable has been consistently negative for all birth cohorts, but only reaches statistical significance for the two birth cohorts of 1915-1924 and 1925-34. For these same two cohorts, the occupational returns to Japanese schooling were significantly steeper than the Anglo rate (replication with 1960 Census data confirms this finding). This suggest a wider occupational gap between those with low and high educational attainment for this generation of Japanese-Americans. These cohorts experienced the internment during World War II in the early stages of their adult careers or as students. They resumed or entered the labor force as young adults in the postwar era. It seems that those with higher educational attainments were able to recoup their loss, but those with less education experienced a permanent loss in their occupational attainment.

The pattern of Chinese effects, both the net ethnic coefficients and the education interaction terms, do not show a consistent pattern across cohorts (nor do they approach statistical significance). The

pattern of Filipino coefficients reveals a net positive effect of ethnicity, but a consistently lower occupational return to education. However, these effects are only significant for the youngest cohort.

These equations have also been estimated with 1960 Census data and with other dependent variables (the probability of professional employment and the probability of self-employment) and the results are generally consistent with those presented here. For the middle cohorts of native-born Japanese men (and to a lesser extent for comparable Chinese), the education interaction term promotes entry into professional employment and is negative in predicting self-employment.

These results are important because they indicate that for native-born Chinese and Japanese men, education brought as much occupational advancement (sometimes more) as it did for majority men. This is not the case for Filipino men. This does not mean that Chinese and Japanese men did not experience occupational discrimination. In fact, the record is clear that formal and informal racial bars were common on the West Coast during much of the first half of the 20th century. But through various channels, including the independent professions and the ethnic economy, Japanese and Chinese men were able to realize economic returns (measured by occupational status) to education that was comparable to Anglos. Along with other factors, this may have reinforced the Asian-American emphasis on educational investment.

CONCLUSIONS

The contemporary pattern of Asian-American educational success has roots that extend back to the late 19th and early 20th century. The historical record, however, is not simply one of a straightforward march from uneducated immigrants to a third generation with post-graduate degrees. Nor can an explanation that begins and ends with the high educational ambitions of Asian-Americans suffice as an interpretation. Both of these elements contain more than a grain of truth, but a close examination of the evidence reveals a more complex picture. The episodic character of Asian immigration has had a major influence on the development of Asian-American minorities in the United States. Moreover, there have been significant variations in the structure of the separate Asian ethnic populations which are masked in the broad label of Asian-Americans. Within the limits of 1960 and 1970 Census data, we have explored the path of educational change for the three major Asian-American groups -- the Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos.

In spite of the intense bigotry and discrimination encountered by Japanese immigrants and their children in the decades prior to World War II, the Japanese community had a number of unusual strengths. First, the immigrant stream which arrived around the turn of the century appears to have had a fairly high level of education -- comparable to the white population of the same generations. The expectations for their children's education was surely no less than their own. The Japanese immigrants entered the farm economy first as laborers and then as farmers, later spreading the ethnic economy to grocery wholesaling and other urban enterprises (Daniels, 1972; Light,1972; Bonacich and

Modell, 1980). While the confinement of Japanese-Americans to the ethnic economy was a mark of their oppression, it also reinforced ethnic solidarity and frequently led to some level of economic success. These conditions may have also strengthened the Japanese commitment to the education of their children. Uhlenberg (1972) observes that the Japanese-American pattern of later age at marriage and a smaller family size may have contributed to a favorable environment for achievement. For the native-born population, our historical analysis reveals that Japanese-Americans had educational levels equivalent with whites early in the twentieth century (both in California and elsewhere). Given the limited opportunities for Japanese-American achievement at the time, it is not very surprising that this early record of educational success became a central element of their ethnic culture.

Chinese immigration to the United States began in the middle of the 19th century and continued for several decades as a stream of male laborers with minimal educational qualifications. With the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, immigration was sharply restricted to the families of resident Chinese and to special cases, most of whom had higher educational qualifications. This meant a sharp reduction in Chinese immigration along with a dramatic increase in the educational levels of later cohorts of Chinese who arrived early in the 20th century. Although it is difficult to assert cause and effect, there was a comparable upward shift in the educational attainments of native-born Chinese-Americans who received their schooling in the 1920s and 1930s. This led to educational parity with whites, both for California and elsewhere.

For Filipinos, the empirical record is much more ambiguous and not quite as positive. There has been a real upgrading of the educational levels of both foreign- and native-born Filipinos across successive cohorts, but parity with whites has yet to be achieved. There is a troubling sign of a slowing-down in the rise of schooling of the native-born Filipinos outside of Hawaii, but the evidence is too shaky to make a conclusive statement.

Several factors do seem to have been common to Asian-American educational advance, particularly for Japanese and Chinese. First, the closing of the door to further Asian immigration certainly lessened the pressures on the local ethnic population to absorb and support additional kinsmen. This may have allowed marginal resources to be invested in the education of children, rather than supporting a growing ethnic enclave. For the middle decades of the twentieth century, the Japanese-American population grew very slowly and the Chinese-American population experienced an absolute decline in numbers for several decades. Moreover, restrictive immigration policies meant that only highly educated Asians were allowed to enter the United States -- immigrants who very often had educational qualifications superior to the native white population of the United States.

Another important factor is that Japanese and Chinese educational attainment seems to have "paid-off" in terms of occupational advancement (measured by Duncan SEI) at the same rate (or higher) than whites. This does not mean that Japanese and Chinese did not experience considerable occupational discrimination (indeed considerable research clearly documents pervasive bigotry). But education was as effective a channel for the social mobility of Asians as it was for Anglos. This may have

been because Asians pursued different occupational careers than those of whites -- specializing in the independent and technical professions, where discrimination is likely to be less. Moreover, skeptics may reasonably doubt that equivalent returns of occupational status to education for Asians means that Asian-Americans attain comparable positions of job authority, public visibility or access to positions of institutional power.

As Asian-Americans have encountered a moderate amount of economic success in the postwar era, their educational attainments have shot up to record levels, where college graduation appears to be the median attainment. While the high educational levels of new Asian immigrants add to this picture of extraordinary educational achievement, it is also the native-born who have participated in this upsurge of educational advancement. Since the ethnic economy and residential segregation appear to have lessened in recent years, it becomes more difficult to find explanations rooted in the structural position of Asian-Americans. While Asian-Americans born in California are most successful, the sharp rise in educational levels is evident in Hawaii and elsewhere. Is the contemporary pattern an example of a short-term cultural lag that will diminish as Asian-Americans become more socially integrated with American society? Or will the distinctly high level of educational ambition and attainment of Asians continue? Neither theory nor the empirical record provide a firm base for a prediction.

REFERENCES

Blalock, Herbert
1967 Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bonacich, Edna
1973 A theory of middleman minorities. American Sociological Review 38:583-94.

1975 Small business and Japanese American ethnic solidarity. Amerasia Journal 3:96-112.

Bonacich, Edna and John Modell
1980 The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity: Small Business in the Japanese-American Community. Berkeley: University of California Press.

California, Department of Industrial Relations
1930 Facts About Filipino Immigration into California. San Francisco: Department of Industrial Relations. Reprinted in 1972 by R. and E. Research Associates, San Francisco, California.

Caudill, William
1952 Japanese-American personality and acculturation. Genetic Psychology Monographs 45, Part 1:3-101.

Caudill, William and George DeVos
1956 Achievement, culture and personality: the case of the Japanese-Americans. American Anthropologist 58:1102-26.

Chen, Anita Beltran
1977 Selectivity in Philippine migration. In Gordon P. Means (ed.), Development and Underdevelopment in Southeast Asia. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Society for Asian Studies.

Chinn, Thomas W.
1969 A History of Chinese in California: A Syllabus. San Francisco: Chinese American Historical Society.

Chiswick, Barry R.
1979 The economic progress of immigrants: some apparently universal patterns. Pp.357-399 in William Fellner (ed.), Contemporary Economic Problems Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Chiswick, Barry R.
1983 An analysis of the earnings and employment of Asian-American men. Journal of Labor Economics 1:197-214.

Connor, John W.
1975 Changing trends in Japanese-American academic achievement. The Journal of Ethnic Studies 2:4:95-98.

Coolidge, Mary Roberts
1909 Chinese Immigration. New York: Henry Hull and Co.

Daniels, Roger
1977 The Politics of Prejudice. New York: Atheneum.

Duncan, Beverley and O.D. Duncan
1968 Minorities and the process of stratification. American Sociological Review 33:356-364.

Endo, Russell
1980 Asian Americans and higher education. Phylon 41:367-378.

Featherman, David
1971 The socio-economic achievements of white religio-ethnic subgroups: social and psychological explanations. American Sociological Review 36:207-222.

Fox, W.S. and E.F. Jackson
1973 Protestant-Catholic differences in educational achievement and persistence in school. Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion 12:65-84.

Glazer, Nathan
1969 Ethnic groups and education: Towards the tolerance of difference. Journal of Negro Education 38:187-195.

Greeley, Andrew M.
1974 Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance. New York: Wiley.

1976 Ethnicity, Denomination and Inequality. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Higham, John
1974 Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New York: Atheneum.

Hirschman, Charles and Morrison G. Wong
1981 Trends in socioeconomic achievement among immigrant and native-born Asian-Americans, 1960-1976. The Sociological Quarterly 22:495-513.

1982 Socioeconomic gains of Asian-Americans, Blacks, and Hispanics: 1960-1976. Paper presented at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Hsu, Francis
1971 The Challenge of the American Dream: The Chinese in the United States. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Ichihashi, Yamato
1932 Japanese in the United States. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jasso, Guillermina and Mark R. Rosenzweig
1982 Estimating the emigration rate of legal immigrants using administrative and survey data: the 1971 cohort of immigrants to the United States. Demography 19:274-290.

Jiobu, Robert M.
1976 Earnings differentials between whites and ethnic minorities: the cases of Asian-Americans, Blacks, and Chicanos. Sociology and Social Research 61:24-38.

Kitano, Harry
1962 Changing achievement patterns of the Japanese in the United States. Journal of Social Psychology 58:257-264.

1969 Japanese-Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kitano, Harry
1974 Japanese-Americans: the development of a middleman minority. Pacific Historical Review 43:500-519.

1976 Japanese-Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 2nd editon.

Kitano, Harry and Stanley Sue
1973 The model minorities. The Journal of Social Issues 29:1-9.

Kung, S.W.
1962 Chinese in American Life: Some Aspects of their History, Status, Problems, and Contributions. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kuo, Wen H.
1981 Colonized status of Asian-Americans. Ethnic Groups 3:3:227-251.

Lasker, B.
1931 Filipino Immigration to the Continental United States and Hawaii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee, Rose Hum
1960 The Chinese in the United States of America. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Levine, Gene N. and Darrell M. Montero
1973 Socioeconomic mobility among three generations of Japanese Americans. Journal of Social Issues. 29:2:33-48.

Li, Peter S.
1976 Ethnic businesses among Chinese in the U.S. The Journal of Ethnic Studies 4:3:35-41.

1977 Occupational achievement and kinship assistance among Chinese immigrants in Chicago. The Sociological Quarterly. 18:478-489.

Lieberson, Stanley
1975 Rank-sum comparisons between groups. Pp. 276-292 in David R. Heise (ed.), Sociological Methodology 1976. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

1980 A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Light, Ivan
1972 Ethnic Enterprise in America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Loewen, James W.
1971 The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lyman, Stanford M.
1974 Chinese Americans. New York: Random House.

Miyamoto, Samuel F.
1972 An immigrant community in America. In Hilary Conroy and T. Scott Miyakawa (eds.), East Across the Pacific. Santa Barbara: Clio Press.

Montero, Darrel and Ronald Tsukashima
1977 Assimilation and educational achievement: the case of the second-generation Japanese-American. Sociological Quarterly 18:490-503.

McKenzie, R.D.
1928 Oriental Exclusion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nam, Charles B., A.L. Rhodes, and R.E. Herriot
1968 School retention by race, religion, and socioeconomic status. Journal of Human Resources 3:171-190.

North, David
1974 Immigrants and the American Labor Market. Manpower Research Monograph No. 31. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Pernia, Ernesto M.
1976 The question of the brain drain from the Philippines. International Migration Review. 10:1:63-72.

Petersen, William
1971 Japanese-Americans: Oppression and Success. New York: Random House.

Rhodes, A. Lewis and Charles B. Nam
1970 The religious context of educational expectations. American Sociological Review 35:253-267.

Rosen, Bernard
1959 Race, ethnicity, and the achievement syndrome. American Sociological Review 24:47-70.

Schmid, Calvin F. and Charles E. Nobbe
1965 Socioeconomic differentials among non-white races. American Sociological Review 30:909-922.

Schmitt, Robert C.
1968 Demographic Statistics of Hawaii 1778-1965. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schwartz, Audrey James
1970 Traditional Values and Contemporary Achievement of Japanese-American Pupils. Los Angeles, California: Center for the Study of Evaluation.

1971 The culturally advantaged: a study of Japanese-American pupils. Sociology and Social Research 55:341-351.

Steinberg, Stephen
1981 The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America. Boston: Beacon Press.

Strong, Edward K.
1970 The Second Generation Japanese Problem. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1934. Reprinted, New York: Arno Press.

Stryker, Robin
1981 Religio-ethnic effects on attainment in the early career. American Sociological Review 46:212-231.

Sung, Betty Lee
1967 Mountain of Gold: The Story of the Chinese in America. New York: Macmillan Co.

Uhlenberg, Peter
1972 Demographic correlates of group achievement: contrasting patterns of Mexican-Americans and Japanese-Americans. Demography 9:119-128.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1943 Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Population. Second Series. Characteristics of the Population: U.S. Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1953 U.S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. IV, Special Reports. Part 3, Chapter B. Nonwhite Population by Race. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1963a U.S. Census of the Population: 1960. Characteristics of the Population. Part I. U.S. Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1963b U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports PC(2)-5B: Educational Attainment. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1963c U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports PC(2)-1C: Nonwhite Population by Race. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1973a U.S. Census of Population: 1970. Characteristics of the Population: Vol. 1, Part 1, U.S. Summary - Section 2. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1973b U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports PC(2)-1G: Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1975 Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1981 U.S. Census of Population: 1980. Supplementary Report PC80-S1-3: Race of the Population by States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1982 Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1982-83. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1983 U.S. Census of Population: 1980. Characteristics of the Population. General Social and Economic Characteristics. Hawaii. PC80-1-C13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights

1978 Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

United States Department of Labor

1979 Seven Years Later: The Experiences of the 1970 Cohort of Immigrants in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

van den Berghe, Pierre L.
1981 The Ethnic Phenomenon. New York: Elsevier.

Vernon, Philip E.
1982 The Abilities and Achievements of Orientals in North America. New York: Academic Press.

Warren, Bruce
1970 Socioeconomic achievement and religion: the American case. Sociological Inquiry 40:130-155.

Warren, Robert and Jennifer Marks Peck
1980 Foreign-born emigration from the United States: 1960-1970. Demography 17:71-84.

Wong, Bernard
1976 Social stratification, adaptive strategies, and the Chinese community in New York. Urban Life 5:1:33-52.

Wong, Morrison
1980a Changes in socioeconomic status of the Chinese males population in the United States from 1960 to 1970. International Migration Review 14:511-24.

1980b Model students?: teachers' perceptions and expectations of their Asian and white students. Sociology of Education 53:236-246.

1982 The cost of being Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino in the United States: 1960, 1970, and 1976. Pacific Sociological Review 25:59-78.

1983 Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of Chinese males in California and New York: 1960-1976. Paper presented at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society.

Wong, Morrison G. and Charles Hirschman
1982 Regional variation in the socioeconomic attainment of Asian-Americans: 1970. Paper presented at the Wingspread Workshop on the Labor Market Impacts of Immigration. Racine, Wisconsin.

1983 The new Asian immigrants. P.318-403 in William C. McCready (ed.), Culture, Ethnicity, and Identity: Current Issues in Research. New York: Academic Press.

Woodrum, Eric
1981 An assessment of Japanese-American assimilation, pluralism and subordination. American Journal of Sociology 87:157-169.

Woodrum, Eric, Colbert Rhodes, and Joe R. Feagin
1980 Japanese-American economic behavior: its types, determinants, and consequences. Social Forces 58:1234-54.

Yee, Albert H.
1976 Asian-Americans in Educational Research. Educational Research 5(2):5-8.

Table 1 Number of Immigrants[a] to the United States from China, Japan and the Philippines

	China[b]	Japan[c]	Philippines[d]
1971-79	206,200	45,400	312,700
1961-70	109,800	40,000	98,400
1951-60	25,200	46,300	19,300
1941-50	16,709	1,555	4,691
1931-40	4,928	1,948	528
1921-30	29,907	33,462	-
1911-20	21,278	83,837	-
1901-10	20,605	129,796	-
1891-1900	14,799	25,942	-
1881-90	61,711	2,270	-
1871-80	123,201	149	-
1861-70	64,301	186	-
1851-60	41,481	-	-

a) The definition of immigrants has varied considerably over this period (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975, pp. 97-98). In general, these figures are lower than the total number of arrivals. Prior to 1906, data were compiled by the country from which the immigrants came; thereafter, by country of last permanent residence. Data by country of birth (published since 1950) show somewhat different levels of immigration from the countries (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979, Tables 126 and 127.)

b) Includes Hong Kong after 1951 and Taiwan after 1957.

c) No record of immigration from Japan prior to 1861.

d) Philippines were not reported separately prior to 1936.

Source: 1851-1950 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975, pp. 109-110.
1951-1979 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982, p. 89.

Table 2 Census Counts and Percent Foreign-Born of Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos in Hawaii and the U.S. Mainland, from the late 19th Century to 198[illegible]

JAPANESE	Hawaii		Mainland U.S.		TOTAL U.S.		% in	
	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Hawaii	Mainland
1980	240	9	461	-	701	-	34	66
1970	218	10	369	28	587	21	37	63
1960	203	12	270	29	473	21	43	57
1950	185	17	142	27	326	21	56	44
1940	158	24	127	37	285	30	55	45
1930	140	35	139	51	278	43	50	50
1920	109	56	111	73	220	64	50	50
1910	80	75	72	94	152	83	53	47
1900	61	92	24	99	85	94	72	28
(1896)	24	91	-	-	-	-	-	-
1890	12	-	2	-	14	-	86	14

CHINESE	Hawaii		Mainland U.S.		TOTAL U.S.		% in	
	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Hawaii	Mainland
1980	56	22	750	-	806	-	7	95
1970	52	11	381	52	433	47	12	88
1960	38	9	198	45	237	40	16	84
1950	32	11	118	47	150	39	21	79
1940	29	17	78	48	106	40	27	73
1930	27	28	75	59	102	50	26	74
1920	24	47	62	70	85	64	28	72
1910	22	67	72	79	93	75	24	77
1900	26	84	90	90	115	86	22	78
(1896)	22	90	-	-	-	-	-	-
1890	15	100	107	99	122	-	12	88
1880	-	-	105	99	-	-	-	-
1870	-	-	63	100	-	-	-	-
1860	-	-	35	-	-	-	-	-

FILIPINOS	Hawaii		Mainland U.S.		TOTAL U.S.		% in	
	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Pop.(000)	%F.B.	Hawaii	Mainland
1980	132	46	643	-	775	-	17	83
1970	95	35	241	60	336	53	28	72
1960	69	41	113	53	182	49	38	62
1950	61	55	62	64	123	60	50	50
1940	53	-	46	-	99	-	54	46
1930	63	-	45	-	108	-	58	42
1920	21	-	5	-	26	-	81	19
1910	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-

Notes: - Figures not available.

Census counts for the same year vary depending upon the base of complete count or sample data (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1963c, p.xi). Figures in this table were selected to maximize the consistency for the same year, e.g., tables that reported both race and nativity.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1943:Table 4; 1953:Tables 28,29,30; 1963a:Table 44; 1963c:Tables 34,58; 1973b:Tables 3,18,33; 1975:p. 117; 1981:Table 1; 1983:Table 94. Schmitt, 1968, Tables 17,26,27; McKenzie, 1928, p. 183.

Table 3 Median Years of Completed Schooling of Ethnic Populations by Birth Cohort (Age in 1960), Sex, and Nativity Status, based upon 1960 Population Census Data

Men

Birth Cohort (Age in 1960)		White	Black	Native Born			Foreign Born		
				Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino
1935-39	(20-24)	12.4	10.8	12.9	13.4	12.3	12.7	13.3	12.8
1925-34	(25-34)	12.3	9.8	12.7	13.3	12.1	15.3	13.0	12.8
1915-24	(35-44)	12.4	8.5	12.4	12.5	10.2	14.5	10.0	8.6
1895-1914	(45-64)	9.3	6.5	10.9	9.0	7.2	8.8	5.9	5.6
Before 1895	(65+)	8.2	4.2	8.3	4.2	6.0	8.0	0.9	2.3

Women

Birth Cohort (Age in 1960)		White	Black	Native Born			Foreign Born		
				Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino
1935-39	(20-24)	12.4	11.5	12.9	12.9	12.4	12.1	12.7	13.6
1925-34	(25-34)	12.3	10.6	12.5	12.7	12.1	12.3	10.9	12.9
1915-24	(35-44)	12.2	9.0	12.3	12.4	9.2	12.4	8.5	11.4
1895-1914	(45-64)	10.1	7.4	8.5	9.8	8.7	8.3	2.9	5.1
Before 1895	(65+)	8.5	5.2	6.1	3.8	7.7	4.3	0.7	0.8

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1963a, Table 3
U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1963b, Tables 19,21,22,23,29,30 and 31.

44

able 4 Net Difference Index of Educational Inequality between Whites and Asian-Americans, by Birth Cohort, Sex, and Nativity Status, based upon 1960 Population Census data

en

Birth Cohort (Age in 1960)		Native Born			Foreign Born		
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino
1935-39	(20-24)	-.28	-.29	.06	-.12	-.21	-.20
1925-34	(25-34)	-.23	-.30	.10	-.38	-.13	-.15
1915-24	(35-44)	-.14	-.19	.24	-.41	.14	.35
1895-1914	(45-64)	-.06	.08	.39	.09	.41	.48
Before 1895	(65+)	-.01	.36	.23	.09	.57	.54

omen

Birth Cohort (Age in 1960)		Native Born			Foreign Born		
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino
1935-39	(20-24)	-.34	-.31	.04	.15	-.07	-.33
1925-34	(25-34)	-.24	-.28	.10	.02	.16	-.17
1915-24	(35-44)	-.04	-.13	.35	-.10	.28	.07
1895-1914	(45-64)	.15	.05	.20	.32	.53	.43
Before 1895	(65+)	.32	.45	.14	.42	.72	.73

ources: Same as Table 3.

Table 5 Mean Years of Schooling and Occupational Status of Foreign-Born Asian-Americans and Native-Born and Foreign-Born Anglos by Birth Cohort and Sex

YEARS OF SCHOOLING

	Men										Women									
	Anglo				Japanese		Chinese		Filipino		Anglo				Japanese		Chinese		Filipino	
	Native-Born		For. Born								Native-Born		For. Born							
Birth Cohort	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.
1935-44[a]	12.5	(.23)	11.9*	(.37)	15.0	(.22)	14.5	(.27)	13.9	(.24)	12.1	(.19)	12.0	(.29)	12.4	(.24)	12.8	(.36)	14.2	(.25)
1925-34[a]	11.8	(.29)	10.4	(.38)	15.2*	(.24)*	12.1	(.42)	12.6	(.33)	11.5	(.24)	11.4	(.25)	11.8	(.20)	9.3	(.58)	12.6	(.35)
1915-24[a]	11.4	(.29)	10.6	(.38)	13.9	(.23)	10.7	(.50)	9.8	(.50)	11.4	(.25)	9.9	(.39)	11.0	(.22)	6.9	(.83)	10.9*	(.45)*
1905-14[a]	10.4	(.33)	10.5	(.47)	9.6	(.29)	7.8	(.70)	6.4	(.65)	10.3	(.31)	9.0	(.44)	8.5	(.40)	6.2	(.95)	6.8	(.87)
1895-1904[b]	9.3	(.38)	9.0	(.49)	7.8	(.58)	4.9	(1.02)	5.3	(.86)	9.5	(.36)	7.6	(.51)	6.9	(.56)	3.8*	(1.34)*	4.3	(1.18)
Before 1895[b]	8.2	(.45)	5.9	(.73)	6.4	(.70)	2.5	(1.67)	3.8	(1.02)	8.6	(.39)	6.2	(.65)	4.9	(.93)	3.7	(1.63)*	-	-

OCCUPATIONAL SEI

	Men										Women									
	Anglo				Japanese		Chinese		Filipino		Anglo				Japanese		Chinese		Filipino	
	Native-Born		For. Born								Native-Born		For. Born							
Birth Cohort	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.	x̄	C.V.
1935-44[a]	43	(.58)	45	(.58)	57	(.43)	55	(.51)	54	(.56)	43	(.47)	40	(.55)	39	(.59)	46	(.46)	43	(.45)
1925-34[a]	42	(.58)	38	(.63)	58*	(.48)*	44	(.67)	47	(.61)	40	(.50)	41	(.48)	29	(.67)	33	(.67)	38	(.60)
1915-24[a]	40	(.57)	40	(.64)	38	(.72)	41	(.62)	30	(.82)	40	(.50)	34	(.66)	28*	(.67)*	32	(.65)	34*	(.64)*
1905-14[a]	37	(.63)	41	(.64)	23	(.84)	31	(.72)	18	(.86)	39	(.50)	36	(.61)	23	(.85)	28*	(.73)*	22	(.88)
1895-1904[b]	30	(.63)	30	(.58)	19	(.74)	25	(.64)	14	(.80)	27	(.56)	25	(.56)	16	(.69)	22	(.68)	-	-
Before 1895[b]	28	(.67)	26	(.61)	19	(.74)	22	(.63)	15	(.74)	26	(.64)	16	(.75)	13	(.54)	-	-	-	-

Notes:
* less than 25 cases per cell
- less than 10 cases per cell
a 1970 Census
b 1960 Census

Sources:
Public Use Samples of the 1960 and 1970 Population Censuses.

Table 6 Mean Years of Schooling (Graded and College)[a] and Percent Attending College of Native-Born by Ethnicity, Birth Cohort, and State of Birth: 1970 Census

	State of Birth									Percent Attending College		
Anglo	California			Hawaii			Elsewhere					
	Total	Graded	College	Total	Graded	College	Total	Graded	College	California	Hawaii	Elsewhere
1935-44	13.3	11.8	1.5	-	-	-	12.2	11.3	1.0	51	-	32
1925-34	12.9	11.4	1.5	-	-	-	11.6	10.7	.9	47	-	26
1915-24	12.6	11.2	1.4	-	-	-	11.4	10.6	.8	35	-	23
1905-1914	11.4*	10.9*	.5*	-	-	-	10.4	9.8	.6	22*	-	19
Before 1905	9.8	9.6	.2	-	-	-	9.3	8.9	.5	10	-	15
Japanese												
1935-44	14.3	11.9	2.4	13.7	11.9	1.8	13.0	11.4	1.7	75	52	48
1925-34	13.2	11.8	1.4	12.5	11.6	1.0	12.6	11.4	1.2	44	30	34
1915-24	12.6	11.6	1.0	10.8	10.3	.5	11.9	11.1	.7	33	15	23
1905-1914	11.5*	10.7*	.8*	9.2	8.7	.5	9.9	9.5	.3	25	12	13
Before 1905	10.3	9.6	.7	6.8	6.8	0	9.6	9.1	.5	20	0	18
Chinese												
1935-44	14.3	12.0	2.3	13.9	11.8	2.0	12.9	11.1	1.8	69	54	47
1925-34	13.6	11.7	1.8	12.7	11.7	1.0	12.0	10.8	1.2	49	27	37
1915-24	13.6*	11.6*	2.0*	12.1	10.9	1.2	10.8	10.2	1.2	52*	30	16
1905-1914	12.4*	10.8*	1.6*	10.7	10.1	.6	9.7	8.8	.9	35*	18	23
Before 1905	5.7	5.3	.4	8.0	7.4	.6	8.0	7.7	.3	13	12	8
Filipino												
1935-44	12.0	10.9	1.1	11.8	11.0	.8	11.0	10.4	.6	36*	29	22
1925-34	12.4	11.4	.9	11.2	10.7	.4	11.2*	10.2*	.9*	43	17	28*
1915-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.8	9.5	.3	-	4	20
1905-1914	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.6	8.3	.2	-	-	11
Before 1905	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.0	6.8	.2	-	-	9

Notes:

- Less than 10
* 25 or less

[a] Graded schooling ranges from 0 to 12 years, college from 1 to 6 years. All persons with 12 or more years of schooling are coded 12 for graded schooling; all with 12 or less years of schooling are coded 0 on the college variable.

Source: Public Use Sample of the 1970 Population Census.

Table 7 Effects[a] of Ethnicity and Education on the Occupational Attainment of Native-Born Men by Birth Cohort: 1970 Census

Birth Cohort (Age at Interview)	1935-44 (25-34)	1925-34 (35-44)	1915-24 (45-54)	1905-14 (55-64)	Before 1905 (65-
ETHNICITY					
Anglo	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	- 9	-21*	-22*	- 6	- 3
Chinese	18*	- 9	12	-10	12
Filipino	27*	2	13	10	8
Years of Schooling	4.9*	4.3*	4.0*	3.6*	3.1*
Years of Schooling X Japanese	0.5	1.3*	1.2*	- 0.2	0.2
Years of Schooling X Chinese	- 1.0	0.8	- 0.8	0.5	- 1.7
Years of Schooling X Filipino	- 2.7*	- 0.6	- 2.2	- 2.1	- 1.8
Constant	-17	- 7	- 3	2	8
R^2 (adjusted)	33.7%	38.1%	34.1%	30.0%	21.8%
(N)	(1222)	(1243)	(1273)	(827)	(415)

Notes:

a The regression equation includes current residence as an independent variable (dummy variable classification: California, Hawaii, New York, Rest of U.S.-Metro, Rest of U.S.-Nonmetro) in addition to those listed above.

* Statistically significant at the .01 level.

Sources: Public Use Sample of the 1970 Population Census